

### DRAWING AMENDMENTS

The drawings were objected to in the Office Action as not conforming to 37 CFR 1.84(u)(1). In particular, the Examiner stated that the term "Fig." should be replaced with "FIG." Applicant has accordingly made the appropriate changes, and replacement drawings, with each drawing labeled "Replacement Sheet", are now attached.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

2  
3

## 5

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

## 4

5  
6  
7  
8

## 20

1  
2  
3  
4

1        **35 U.S.C. § 112**

2        Claim 34 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for  
3        indefiniteness. The Examiner stated in the Action that is “is unclear whether the  
4        ‘One or more computer-readable’ media of line 1 is the ‘device’ of the preamble of  
5        claim 29 or whether it is another memory altogether.” (Office Action, p. 10).  
6        Applicant has thus amended claim 34 to provide further clarity.

7  
8        **Double Patenting**


9        Claims 1-40 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created  
10       doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims  
11       1-30 of copending Application No. 10/301,800. A terminal disclaimer  
12       accompanies this response to obviate the double patenting rejection.

13  
14       **Conclusion**

15       Claims 1-41 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests  
16       prompt allowance of the subject application. If any issue remains unresolved that  
17       would prevent allowance of this case, **the Examiner is requested to urgently**  
18       **contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.**

19  
20  
21       Date: Aug. 1, 2005

22       Respectfully Submitted,

23       By:   
24       Lewis C. Lee  
25       Lee & Hayes, pllc  
       Reg. No. 34,656  
       (509) 324-9256 ext. 211